



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,918	11/18/2003	Yoshinobu Honkura	245460US0	4019

22850 7590 06/20/2007  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

SHEEHAN, JOHN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/20/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/714,918	HONKURA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	John P. Sheehan	1742	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John P. Sheehan. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Vincent Shier. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-12.

Identification of prior art discussed: the references applied in the Final Rejection mailed March 8, 2007.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Shier and the Examiner discussed various amendments that could be made to the claims including adding the limitation regarding the alloy powder having microcracks and various magnetic property limitations. Mr. Shier also indicated that he has data that would show that the claimed products have different properties than the applied prior art products. The Examiner indicated that because it is after Final he probably would not enter this amendment nor consider the declaration at this time. The Examiner also indicated that the amendment adding the microcrack limitation in combination with a declaration and any data in the specification would appear to weaken the Examiner's rejections..